

REMARKS

Claims 18-30 are presently pending and stand rejected.

The Office Action objects to the specification. In particular, Assignee has amended paragraph 38.1 and paragraph 0039 as suggested by Examiner. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the objections to the specification.

Additionally, the Office Action has objected to the specification for failure to provide antecedent basis for "selectable range". Assignee has amended the claims to remove the foregoing claim language.

Moreover, claims 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Assignee has amended claim 24 in a manner that now renders the foregoing rejection moot. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal the foregoing rejection.

Claims 18 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Lee. Although Assignee maintains traverse of the rejection, in the interests of clarity Assignee has amended claims 18 and 24 to recite, among other limitations, "wherein the single command expressly states a starting address and an ending address of said specified range".

Lee does not teach the foregoing. For example, clearly commands "501 and 601 do not include the capability to expressly state a starting address and an ending address. See Col. 10, Line 59 - Col. 11, Line 36. Examiner has previously indicated that Lee "discloses the command 601 contains fields such as CRd to select external memory as first range, internal DEC memory as second range, and local

memory as third possible range". Examiner also makes citation to col. 11, lines 15-19. However, none of the these commands expressly state a beginning address and an ending address. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claims 18 and 24 and dependent claims 19-23, 25-28, and allowance of claim 29.

Additionally, claim 30 is added, reciting, among other limitations, "wherein the single command expressly includes a starting address and an ending address associated with the particular one of the plurality packets". Assignee respectfully requests allowance of new claim 30.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that each of the pending claims are allowable and Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The office action makes various other statements regarding the invention that are now moot and will not be addressed. Assignee reserves the right to respond to these statements in the future, should the need arise. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: December 11, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100